



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Mackenzie pass from this plural, experiences, to the singular experience? What reason has he, on his own principles, for believing there are any other experiences? Each man makes a construction differing numerically if not qualitatively from the construction of each other man. How then, except by blind faith, can Professor Mackenzie assert that it is one world that we know?

In summing up the results of his genetic survey, Professor Mackenzie says, "we now see that the world of matter and the world of thought, in the only sense in which these two can be set in opposition to one another, are both ideal constructions." But this is just an assertion. Professor Mackenzie has not proved that each mind constructs its world. He has not even demonstrated the plausibility of such a view. And further, such a view leads to great difficulties; it is difficult to see how Professor Mackenzie can avoid a solipsistic conclusion. "Our genetic survey" has put us in a position "to view the various elements of our experience in relation to the whole of our experience," he says; and this it may have done, but it has not shown that mind and matter are aspects of reality in the sense in which aspect is to be distinguished from part.

The last part of the book contains a discussion of various "constructions," perceptual, scientific, ethical, æsthetic, religious, and speculative, and also criticises these "constructions." There is much interesting reading in these last chapters; but one's estimate of the book will depend largely on one's agreement or disagreement with Professor Mackenzie with regard to the subject dealt with in Part II. that is "his genetic method." The book might have been more convincing if there had been more argument. As here set forth Professor Mackenzie's philosophy does not convey conviction; but, then, conviction is too much to expect from any philosopher.

A. R. AINSWORTH.

KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

PRINCIPLES OF CLASS TEACHING. By J. J. Findlay, M. A. London: Macmillan & Co., 1902. Pp. xx, 442.

There are several reasons why we should look forward with interest to a volume from the pen of Dr. Findlay. He has had experience of more than one type of public school. His knowledge of the literature of pedagogy is of the widest, and he

has had the singular advantage of studying the subject in Germany, in an environment sympathetic, stimulating, and scientific. As for teachers, he knows the article in the rough as well as the finished product. And finally, he has had an almost unique opportunity in the position he occupies at present, as the Head Master of what is in some respects a new type of school—the intermediate school of Wales. He started with a clean sheet. He had not to struggle with the inertia of a staff trained in other ways, and with those vested interests which hamper the reformer in his attempts at reconstruction. He had a fair field for putting his principles to the test of experiment, and one result, at any rate, is the present volume, which is thus “the work of craftsmen who are carrying on school business under the ordinary conditions.”

The book is not one to be dipped into. The author's scope is so wide, the conception of his task so homogeneous, and his treatment so elaborate in its detail, that it can only be described by one of his own technical terms as a *Methodische Einheit*. It is a great deal more than a text-book for the neophyte. It is the reasoned work of a man who is saturated with the literature of his subject, who has retained an open mind, who has embodied the results of mature experience and reflection in a volume which, in its final form, will narrowly approach being a classic.

The book has its defects, of course, but they are not defects in form. They are mainly due to the hurried preparation of the work for the press, for which the author makes a somewhat inadequate apology in the preface—“it has necessarily been put together in spare moments!” If within the next two years Dr. Findlay will bring out a second edition, his readers will pardon him. But, alas, they will not so readily condone the unhallowed outrage of such a misquotation from the “*In Memoriam*,” as “*Let knowledge grow from hour to hour.*” It is as the concertina for shepherd's pipe of oaten straw. It is a far worse slip than “*Le Contrat Sociale*,” on p. 36. For which we condole with the author.

Readers of this JOURNAL will be interested to hear what is the attitude of Dr. Findlay towards the question of the teaching of Ethics in schools. He groups together “Logic, Psychology, Ethics, Theology, and above all, Philosophy,” and forbids their intrusion within the precincts of the school, “for they can only be apprehended by the adult mind.” “Civics and Economics . . . are

forced on the pupil's mind in defiance of psychology. . . . Let the terms be what you will—labor and capital, or bribery and corruption—if the learner has no experience or analogous apperceiving concept to rely upon, he is deluding himself with idle words." Let us see, then, what part is played by Bible lessons in the child's life. "The Bible lesson is expressly intended as a supplement to the more personal and private influence of the Church and the home; for the public school of the present day, being composed of pupils of immature development and of all variety of domestic upbringing, cannot venture to deal with the hidden life of the child; and where it ventures so to intrude, it pays the penalty. The Scriptures, as taught in an English institution for public education, ought to be limited to giving the pupils a proper acquaintance with the main thread of the story of the Old and New Testaments." Here we must join issue with the author. If this be the ideal, it means the perpetuation of the reign of the "hand-book;" it means inevitably a continued devotion to the system which is aptly typified by the cryptic lines:—

‘Miss Ramoth-Gilead,’ take Jehoiakim,
Let Abner by and spot Melchizedek.

Apparently, then, the author is content to leave the child's moral training to that elusive but potent element—the tone of the school, "The personal *immediate* influence of the teacher," who is restricted, however by being forbidden "to deal with the hidden life of the child." The Bible is not even to be taught as literature (p. 69) although (p. 68) one of the branches of the time-table is "Lessons in the Bible which is at once History and Literature." As for the other subjects which are swept away with ruthless hand, we hope that some day, Dr. Findlay, who has a pretty taste for dialogue, will support his exclusion of Philosophy and Ethics from the curriculum of secondary schools, by a dialogue between himself and, shall we say, Mr. T. W. Dunn. The latter must, however, be drawn with more virility than the feeble creature who figures as "Old School" on pp. 303-308. As for civics, the difficulty of teaching this subject, except to older children, is acknowledged even by the much abused Board of Education. But that is hardly a reason for its exclusion. We cannot see that there is much in Dr. Findlay's objection that there is no basis of experience. A boy's school life, if well-ordered and healthy, should teach him the meaning of "all for each" and "each for

Vol. XIII.—No. 2

all." Loyalty to the home, to the school, to the city, lead naturally to the larger patriotism. Surely the author's objections apply equally to history as a school subject. In fact, I cannot see how history can be taught without introducing the child to the fundamental principles which underlie the idea of the State. The school is a period of preparation for life in society and in the State. The boy must be prepared to be a citizen, though, of course, as far as the school is concerned, his instruction in civic duties need only be of an elementary character. We cannot afford to turn out into the world a boy who is ignorant of the meaning attached to such expressions as:—The supremacy of the law, nationality. Nor need we. The materials are ready to hand. The one is illustrated by the government of the school. The other cannot be eliminated from history, if faithfully taught.

There are many points on which Dr. Findlay speaks out boldly enough to please the most radical of reformers. While one agrees with what he says about the educational work of Bain, one cannot help feeling that there was no necessity for the author to have been quite so splenetic. With regard to the time at which the child should begin the study of Latin, we are glad to see that he postpones it to the age of thirteen. We note with unmixed pleasure the support he gives to the system which he calls the "intensive plan" of continuous study at a single branch of work. The Time-Tables in the volumes will show to those who are initiated that the author is a past-master of a very difficult part of his professional labors. Finally we must warn the reader that Dr. Findlay is not writing with the fear of examinations before his eyes. He is writing for masters who wish to *educate* the children committed to their care.

W. J. GREENSTREET.

STROUD, GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

THE ETHICAL PHILOSOPHY OF SIDGWICK. Nine Essays, Critical and Expository. By F. H. Hayward, M. A., B. Sc. (Lond.) B. A. (Cantab.) Fellow of the College of Preceptors. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd., 1901.

Mr. Hayward is a Fellow of the College of Preceptors and his book is doubtless intended primarily for the use of students who are obliged to carry on their philosophical studies remote from lectures and classrooms. The book seems admirably suited to be a handbook to such study.